



S/N 10/027,620

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	OKUYAMA ET AL.	Examiner:	K. GROUP
Serial No.:	10/027,620	Group Art Unit:	1755
Filed:	DECEMBER 19, 2001	Docket No.:	10873.856US01
Title:	DIELECTRIC CERAMIC COMPOSITION AND DIELECTRIC DEVICE		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 7, 2003.

By:
Name:

Kristine A. Wacek
Kristine A. Wacek

DECLARATION OF JODI GANDEL-KLEIN IN SUPPORT OF PETITION
TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED
NOV 18 2003
TC 1700

Dear Sir:

I, Jodi Gandel-Klein, declare and state:

1. I am the Docketing Supervisor for Merchant & Gould, the law firm prosecuting the above-referenced patent application. I have been Docketing Supervisor since November 17, 1997.
2. I am responsible for overseeing all incoming Patent and Trademark Office communications and oversee those responsible for seeing that these communications are properly docketed and entered into our computerized docketing system.
3. Incoming mail received by the firm is sorted into correspondence that may require docketing and correspondence that does not require docketing. The correspondence that may require docketing is further distinguished between correspondence from the Patent and Trademark Office and other correspondence. After the incoming mail has been date stamped to show date of receipt, a member of the firm's docketing department retrieves the mail that may

RECEIVED

NOV 14 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

require docketing and brings it to the docketing department. The appropriate personnel then docket the correspondence.

4. If such an Office Action had been received, the communication would have been docketed by entering into the computerized docket system the date the Office Action was mailed. The computerized docket system would then calculate the due dates for response to the Office Action up to the six month statutory deadline. The first page of the Office Action would then be initialed by the person docketing the Office Action to indicate that it had been docketed and forwarded to the attorney responsible for the patent application for further action, e.g., reporting to the client, etc.

5. I have reviewed the records in the firm's docket system and find no entry for the March 28, 2003 Office Action for this application, nor any other evidence that would suggest that the Office Action actually was received by the firm.

6. In view of the above, I believe that the Office Action for this application was never delivered to the docketing department for docketing.

7. I declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with knowledge that willful, false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18, of the United States Code and that such willful, false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or document or any registration resulting therefrom.

Dated: Nov 7, 2003

By: 
John Gandel-Klein